

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/707,575

Applicant(s)

GOMBERT, BARRY G.

Examiner

Brian P. Whipple

Art Unit

2152

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian P. Whipple.(3) Aashish R. Karkhanis.(2) Kenny Lin.(4) Kirk Berkhimer.Date of Interview: 14 November 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15.Identification of prior art discussed: Rhoads et al., U.S. Publication No. 2001/0032251 A1.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


BUNJOO JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
Examiner's signature, if required

11/15/7

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clarification was given regarding the application of Rhoads to claim 15 for the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) prior art rejection. The general nature of the invention, according to the specification, versus the prior art of Rhoads and in the field as a whole was discussed. No agreement was reached regarding potential amendments or arguments. Applicant's representatives expressed an intention to evaluate the specification for the purpose of amending the claims and submit a formal amendment based on such an evaluation.